

Minutes
EQR Users Group
August 14, 2003, 10:00 a.m. EDT

Agenda Item 1. Introduction and Logistics

The meeting was called to order at 10:00. Five EQR users joined FERC Staff in the meeting room. Over the course of the meeting 62 remote sites connected.

The remote portion of the meeting was conducted via WebEx allowing remote participants to view meeting documents on their computer screens while they were listening to the proceedings on the phone. WebEx also provided remote polling capabilities so that participants could vote on answers to questions posed by FERC Staff. (Note: Due to our unfamiliarity with the software, while the participants' total votes were captured, individual responses to the polls were not saved.)

Agenda Item 2. Standardizing Control Areas Using NERC

There was general agreement that NERC control areas could be used as standards for Control Area fields in the EQR.

Some discussion arose regarding the level of detail associated with the NERC Control Areas. A few generators have become their own control areas. These small control areas are not included in the control area map that was displayed at the meeting (ftp://www.nerc.com/pub/sys/all_updl/oc/rs/ctrl_nerc.jpg), but they are, apparently, included in the NERC Control Areas by Region document that was circulated (<http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/eqr/groups-workshops/users-group-mat/081403/ctrlareg.pdf>). Steve Reich of FERC Staff indicated its intent to use the more comprehensive list, but that that list would be reviewed further before the next meeting.

Ken Skweres of Duke asked whether the list could be adapted as control areas were added or changed. Barbara Bourque of FERC Staff indicated that such a change would be easy to implement in the software.

The group was asked about its comfort with using NERC acronyms for the control areas (see Poll #1 attached). The poll indicated that there was little problem with using them.

The group was also asked whether making the Control Area field mandatory for transactions would be problematic. Of those responding to the question, 94 percent indicated that there would be no problem. Jonathan Andrews of The Structure Group expressed concern about how to identify a control area for a transaction that is not control-area specific (e.g., a ancillary service provided to a market as a whole). Ms. Bourque indicated that an option such as "Other" or "Not Applicable" will be provided for such an eventuality

Mr. Reich indicated that FERC Staff is also interested in creating standards for certain common market hubs in the Specific Location fields. He provided a list of fifteen points traded on ICE. Standards for these locations would be set but

entries in the field would not be restricted to only those provided. Further discussion on this matter was deferred

Agenda Item 3. Product Names

Mr. Reich discussed the goals of reducing the number of Product Names and clearly defining those that remained. The group went through the strawman list of Product Names (<http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/eqr/groups-workshops/users-group-mat/081403/08-14-03allpages.xls>).

Regarding consideration of the Product Names in the strawman that may be replaced by energy (Poll #2), there was concern that “energy” was not fully descriptive of some of the Product Names to be replaced. Many of the items on the list, such as “Unit Power Sale” as raised by Jane Daly of APS, have elements that include capacity and/or ancillary services. Donald Rucker raised the point that “power,” which is part of several of the names in the list, has traditionally referred to a product that includes both “energy” and “capacity.” Held over for further discussion were “Unit Power Sale” and “Load Following.”

The discussion on Product Names that may be eliminated because of repetition of other products (Poll #3) indicated that

- (1) “Dynamic Transfer” could likely be replaced by “Energy.”
- (2) A considerable amount of uncertainty is associated with the Product Name “Must Run.” Many of the group, including Jeff Salway, Margaret Lowe, and Nancy Lee interpreted it to be associated with being called upon to start a unit. Steve Reich of FERC Staff had been interpreting it to mean a contractual take-or-pay provision. Mr. Salway indicated, and Julie Gauldin of PUC Texas confirmed, that ERCOT has a specific contract provision for “Reliability Must Run” units.
- (3) “Network Operating Agreement” is defined in OATT tariffs.

It was determined that the discussion of “Must Run” should continued with a smaller group before the next meeting in order to create a definition that could be brought before the whole users group.

The discussion of Product Name definitions for products associated with Contract Products and not Transactions (Poll #4) indicated that:

- (1) “Customer Charge” should continue to be included on the Transactions Tab
- (2) “Demand Charge” could be eliminated as redundant with “Capacity”
- (3) The definition of “Direct Assignment Facilities Charge” should be reworded as “Charges for facilities or portions of facilities that are constructed *or used* by transmission owners for the sole use/benefit of a particular customer requesting service.”

Additional discussion on these items and on the definitions for the remaining Product Names was precluded due to time constraints. A poll was taken on the

definitions, but in the rush to move on, the results were not saved. Discussion was deferred to the next meeting.

Agenda Item 4. Other Issues

A poll (Poll #6) was taken on the proposed guidance regarding day ahead/real time reconciliation (<http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/eqr/groups-workshops/users-group-mat/081403/08-14-03day-ahead.pdf>). The poll results made it clear that additional discussion would be needed on the issue. Ms. Bourque suggested that a smaller group be formed to discuss the matter before the next meeting. She asked for interested parties to contact eqr@ferc.gov.

Agenda Item 5. Next Meeting

It was generally agreed upon, that the next meeting of the Users Group should be in September and that a greater amount of time, perhaps two days, would be necessary to work through the remaining issues. Mr. Reich suggested that smaller groups may be useful to narrow down discussion on issues prior to that meeting. He requested that interested parties contact eqr@ferc.gov.

Agenda Item 6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned shortly after 1:00 pm EDT.